



# Public Services

128 North Second Street · Fourth Floor Courthouse · Yakima, Washington 98901  
(509) 574-2300 In-State 1-800-572-7354 • FAX (509) 574-2301 • [www.co.yakima.wa.us](http://www.co.yakima.wa.us)

VERN M. REDIFER, P.E., Director

## DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

1. **Description of Proposal:** Columbia Ready-mix proposed a Plan 2015 text amendment to existing Plan 2015 policies. The proposed text amendment reads as follows with the underlined portion to be inserted in the Mapping Criteria portion of the Agricultural Resources Areas text in the Land Use subchapter of Plan 2015, Volume 1, Chapter I: Mapping Criteria: 7. Criteria for de-designating agricultural resources lands shall follow the "Agricultural Resource De-designation Analytical Process" found below. The agricultural resource de-designation criteria will be used for plan amendments and updates to change a land use from Agricultural Resource to another land use designation. The de-designation analytical process shall not be applicable when Agricultural Resources Lands are proposed for re-designation to another Plan 2015 Economic Resource Land designation
2. **File Number:** SEP 06-043
3. **Owner:** Columbia Ready-mix, Inc.  
P.O. Box 9337  
Yakima, WA 98909  
**Proponent:** Same
4. **Location of Proposal:** Not Applicable
5. **Lead Agency:** Yakima County Planning Division
6. **Determination:** The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it will not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after a careful review of the completed environmental checklist, and other information on file with the lead agency. This information (including all environmental documentation) is available to the public on request and can be examined in our offices during regular business hours. Environmental documents include: SEPA checklist, this threshold determination and submittal materials.
7. **Comment and Appeal Information:** This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2). The Lead Agency will not act on this proposal for 14 days from the date of issuance. You may submit comments on this proposal to the address below before **5 p.m. on August 23, 2006**. Agencies and those providing comments will receive a copy of the decision once all comments have been considered.
8. **SEPA Responsible Official:** STEVEN M. ERICKSON
9. **Position/Title:** Planning Official / SEPA Responsible Official
10. **Address:** 128 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Fourth Floor Courthouse, Yakima, WA 9890
11. **Date:** August 9, 2006

YAKIMA COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

**INTRODUCTION**

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS (in many cases the preparation of an EIS is not necessary, even when significant impacts have been identified, the permit approval is conditioned in such a way to mitigate the impact). Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply". Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impacts.

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply". IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project applicant", and "property of site" should be read as "proposal", "proposer", and "affected geographic areas", respectively.

**A. BACKGROUND** (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

1. Name of Proponent: Yakima County Phone: 574-2230  
Address: 128 N. Second Street, Room 417; Yakima, WA 98901
2. Person Completing Form: Michael Kerins Phone: 509-574-2300  
Address: 128 N. Second Street, Room 417; Yakima, WA 98901
3. Name of Property Owner: Not applicable: non-project action  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Date Checklist Submitted: July 31, 2006
5. Agency Requiring Checklist: Yakima County Planning Division
6. Name of Proposal, if Applicable: Columbia Ready-Mix Text Amendment to Plan 2015
7. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): Environmental review estimated for completion



approximately September 1, 2006

8. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansions, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. *No.*
9. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.
- *Yakima County Comprehensive Plan (Plan 2015: A Blueprint for Yakima County Progress) and related SEPA documents (FEIS)*
  - *Columbia Ready-Mix ZON04-008 / SEP04-054*
10. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. *Not applicable: non-project action.*
11. List any governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known. *Action on the proposal by Board of Yakima County Commissioners.*
12. Give brief complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. *Columbia Ready-Mix proposed a Plan 2015 text amendment to existing Plan 2015 policies. The proposed text amendment reads as follows with the underlined portion to be inserted in the Mapping Criteria portion of the Agricultural Resources Areas text in the Land Use subchapter of Plan 2015, Volume 1, Chapter 1:*

*Mapping Criteria: 7. Criteria for de-designating agricultural resources lands shall follow the "Agricultural Resource De-designation Analytical Process" found below. The agricultural resource de-designation criteria will be used for plan amendments and updates to change a land use from Agricultural Resource to another land use designation. The de-designation analytical process shall not be applicable when Agricultural Resources Lands are proposed for re-designation to another Plan 2015 Economic Resource Land designation*

13. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit application related to this checklist. *This is a non-project action. The proposed text amendment will apply County-wide.*
14. Taxation Parcel Number(s): *Not applicable.*

C. **SIGNATURE**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge, I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature of Proponent or Person Completing Form

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael P. Kerins, AICP

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Submitted

SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise? *The proposed text amendment will not change the designation of any currently designated agricultural resource lands. Any future agricultural resource lands proposed for re-designation to any designation other than another resource lands designation are required to undergo an environmental review and de-designation process to determine the impacts and appropriateness of such a re-designation. Any agricultural resource lands proposed for re-designation to any other resource lands designation are required to undergo a comprehensive plan amendment process, consistency review with the applicable proposed new resource lands designation, and environmental review, including non-project and/or project level review, as applicable.*

2. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are: *None are proposed. As stated, an environmental review, comprehensive plan amendment process, and comprehensive plan consistency review will be required for any future agricultural resource lands proposed for re-designation to some other resource designation.*

3. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish or marine life? *The proposed text amendment will have no effect on plants, animals, fish or marine life.*

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are: *None are proposed.*

4. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources? *The proposed text amendment will have no effect on the depletion rate of energy or natural resources.*

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are: *No additional measures are being proposed above those already in effect.*

5. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protections; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplain, or prime farmlands? *The proposed text amendment will not change the designation of any currently designated agricultural resource lands. Any future agricultural resource lands proposed for re-designation to any designation other than another resource lands designation are required to undergo an environmental review and de-designation process to determine the impacts and appropriateness of such a re-designation. Any agricultural resource lands proposed for re-designation to any other resource lands designation are required to undergo a comprehensive plan amendment process, consistency review with the applicable proposed new resource lands designation, and environmental review, including non-project and/or project level review, as applicable. No effects on environmentally sensitive or other protected areas are expected from the text amendment.*

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are: *No measures are being proposed.*

6. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans. *The proposal does not allow nor encourage land or shoreline uses that are incompatible with existing plans. Shoreline proposals will continue to fall under the jurisdiction of the county's Shoreline Master*



## ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

Columbia Ready-Mix proposed a **Plan 2015** text amendment to existing **Plan 2015** policies. The proposed text amendment reads as follows with the underlined portion to be inserted in the Mapping Criteria portion of the Agricultural Resources Areas text in the Land Use subchapter of **Plan 2015**, Volume 1, Chapter 1:

Mapping Criteria: 7. Criteria for de-designating agricultural resources lands shall follow the "Agricultural Resource De-designation Analytical Process" found below. The agricultural resource de-designation criteria will be used for plan amendments and updates to change a land use from Agricultural Resource to another land use designation. The de-designation analytical process shall not be applicable when Agricultural Resources Lands are proposed for re-designation to another Plan 2015 Economic Resource Land designation

## STAFF ANALYSIS

*On December 15, 2005, the Board of Yakima County Commissioners approved resolution 720-2005 adopting ordinance 10-2005 amending the relevant **Plan 2015** map, rezoning the above parcels and implementing the proposed text amendment to **Plan 2015**. The Board's decision was subsequently appealed by Superior Asphalt & Concrete Co. to the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.*

*As a result of the appeal, the Eastern Washington Growth Management Hearings Board found that an adequate environmental review was not conducted on the proposed text amendment and that the County should take appropriate legislative action to correct the deficiency and to bring themselves into compliance. The Board's decision did not find that agricultural resource lands take precedence over other resource lands, including mineral resource lands. In order to comply with the Board's order regarding adequacy of environmental review of the text amendment, a new environmental review is being conducted to re-examine potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed text amendment to **Plan 2015**, Volume I, Chapter 1.*

*For SEPA review purposes, the critical aspect of the proposed text amendment is that its effect is limited to applicable review processes. The text amendment does not re-designate any Yakima County lands, nor does it alter the criteria for designating any applicable resource lands. For any potential resource lands designation or re-designation, consistency analysis will be required as measured against **Plan 2015** criteria as well as analysis under SEPA, whether at a project or non-project level, as applicable. This consistency analysis requires that all nonagricultural uses be disfavored in agricultural resource areas, subject to review of the protections needed for agricultural uses and the nature of the proposed nonagricultural use. The proposed text amendment has no applicability to re-designation of agricultural lands for any urban or rural designations. It also has no likely applicability to the re-designation of agricultural lands to the Forest Resource land designation, since forest lands cannot typically be created out of agricultural lands. No cumulative impacts of the proposed text amendment are expected because the text amendment does not relax or alter the criteria for designating any applicable resource lands, nor does it relax general comprehensive plan consistency analysis or SEPA requirements. Further, the proposed text amendment does not alter any of the substantive standards for de-designating Agricultural Resource lands.*

*Locations of acceptable mineral resources are limited and must be protected where they are determined to be. Additionally, they are a non-renewable resource, which makes their protection for future availability critical. Mineral resource areas that are designated but are not anticipated as being suitable for mining until sometime in the future offer additional protection for the agricultural resource land uses in the interim prior to actual mining operations. For example, a parcel designated as an Agricultural Resource land is currently eligible for a small lot exemption that allows a one to three acre parcel to be created around an existing dwelling every 15 years, provided the dwelling has been there for at least five years. This small lot exemption process has the potential to have a cumulative impact to commercial agriculture over time. The Mineral Resource designation would eliminate the small lot exemption provision, thereby eliminating many residential related impacts to commercial agriculture prior to the actual commencement of mining sometime in the future. The fixed location of mineral resource sites, together with the mineral resource site designation criteria, will also mean that the proposed text amendment will not have a cumulative effect of fostering urbanization or suburbanization development pressure on agricultural resource areas. Sites suitable for potential mineral resource designation could not be approved under the mineral resource criteria in close proximity to urban or suburban lands, and the text amendment would thus have no likely effect on vulnerable agricultural resource lands which exist at the fringes of agricultural resource land areas. Finally, the existing text of **Plan 2015** specifies that any unacceptable conflict between designation of Mineral Resource lands in an agricultural resource lands area should be resolved in favor of agricultural land uses.*

*Based on the above analysis, the proposed **Plan 2015** text amendment is determined to have no probable significant adverse environmental impacts.*